



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Englishman composed the portion of the poem narrating that return. It might even be conjectured that the poet was the first to make the Grendel hero a Geat. For in the original Grendel story it was necessary only that the hero be a stranger.

The non-Scandinavian material in *Beowulf* is the allusions to Hama, Weland, and Siegmund. The poet may have got these either from England or from German merchants in Friesland. A detail of the poem, probably original with the poet, is the messenger's foreboding of hostility towards the Geats on the part of the Franks and Frisians. Such a fear would not naturally arise in the saga material of the North. Aside from these additions, the English redactor kept fairly close to his material. He emphasized certain episodes and subordinated others, but the general arrangement in two groups was adhered to. There is an almost total absence of cross reference, and the poem as it stands contains the Danish elements in one section and the Geatish in the other.

The foregoing summary indicates the main outlines of Professor Schück's argument. His theory is striking in its originality and its boldness, and it is presented with a good deal of effectiveness. Various objections will occur to the reader, one or two of which have been indicated in the foot-notes. But even if this ingenious hypothesis cannot stand, the general discussion and many suggestive details will prove to be of real service in the criticism of the poem.

VICTOR OSCAR FREEBURG.

College of the City of New York.

THE STAGE HISTORY OF SHAKESPEARE'S KING
RICHARD THE THIRD, by Alice I. Perry Wood. Pp.
186. New York, The Columbia University Press, 1909.

In the preface to this monograph Dr. Wood expressly rules out of her province discussions of text, date, and authorship, and confines the inquiry solely to tracing the fortunes of *Richard the Third* upon the stage. The wisdom of excluding problems of text and date from independent investigation, is questionable. The early history of this drama and its relationship to contemporary plays, as well as echoes and imitations of its lines by later writers, can scarcely be interpreted without some fairly definite assumptions as to the exact date of composition, and the authority of the Folio text as opposed to the Quarto. But in the present state of Shakespearian knowledge, these last two questions are far from settlement.

Dr. Wood's method of relating the *Richard* to contemporary dramas is not to seek for new sources, but to analyze

the chronicle history plays of the early nineties and to stress the conventional elements of this type, before giving a scene-by-scene analysis of Shakespeare's play. By this inductive method, the same method that is employed with far wider scope and keener penetration by Dr. C. R. Baskervill in his recent study, *English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy*, Miss Wood makes the chronicle history a much more clearly defined *genre* than most critics have noticed. Frequently Dr. Woods finds occasion to acknowledge indebtedness to Professor Churchill's admirable monograph on the development of the Richard story (*Richard the Third up to Shakespeare, Palæstra*, No. 10, Berlin, 1900), and to Mr. F. G. Fleay's works on Elizabethan dramatic history.

Just here the book leaves something to be desired; the writer confidently relies on Mr. Fleay's conclusions. Since the preparation of her book, Mr. W. W. Greg in editing *Henslowe's Diary*, and Mr. J. T. Murray in his *English Dramatic Companies*, 1558-1642, have demonstrated how little dependence can be placed on Mr. Fleay's clever guesswork. But his results were subject to general suspicion long ago, and they should not have been accepted with such easy grace. For example, in a long foot-note at the bottom of pages 13-14, Dr. Wood lists "the extant tragedies and history plays produced between 1580 and 1594." One is surprised to find there no mention of the *Second and Third Parts of Henry the Sixth* or of *Richard the Second*, to go no further than Shakespeare. But the dates assigned are more questionable than the omissions. Taking the names almost at random, we have *Solyman and Perseda*, dated 1583; *The First Part of Jeronimo*, c. 1584; *Arden of Feversham*, 1585; and *King Leir*, 1588-9; when the consensus of present scholarly opinion is to date each play from two to five years later. The point is not that Dr. Wood's opinions are slightly at variance with those generally accepted, but that the dates appear without question marks; and the basis for them seems to be Mr. Fleay.

Later chapters of the book have chiefly to do with the substitution of Cibber's text on the stage for Shakespeare's, with contemporary accounts of the acting of Garrick, Kemble, Kean, Macready, Irving, and others in the title rôle, and, most valuable contribution of all, the history of *Richard the Third* on the American stage. This play, it seems, is the earliest recorded Shakespearian drama to be acted in the United States, being presented by certain Philadelphia comedians in New York, March 5, 1750, and again by an English company in New York in 1753. An excellent summary of the work, and an interpretation of the history involved, form a brief concluding chapter.

One or two errors of minor importance should be corrected. In the Index, p. 182, a reference to Howard; for "Sir Robert," read "James," Sir Robert's younger brother, and a less famous dramatist, but the man who provided a happy ending for *Romeo and Juliet*. On p. 85, n. 26, the lines quoted from *The Mirror for Magistrates*, should be tagged as consciously imitated from Chaucer's "Man of Law's Tale," ll. 834-861. Misprints are not numerous. The most serious one is a transposition of three lines of verse from the top of page 69 to the bottom, whereby they are lodged in a footnote instead of in the text.

While the work as a whole is not distinguished by brilliancy of treatment, it gives a straightforward account of some interesting chapters in different periods of English dramatic history, grouped about one of the most popular plays that Shakespeare wrote. Its special value lies in the right emphasis which it places on the relations of this play to its contemporaries, and the entertaining narrative of *Richard the Third* on the American stage.

The University of Texas.

ROBERT ADGER LAW.